Application No.: 10/673,161

Amendment dated: September 8, 2009

Reply to Office Action of November 7, 2008

Attorney Docket No.: 0016.0025US1

Remarks

Claims 1-6 and 8-27 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 19, and 25 have

been amended in various particulars as indicated hereinabove. New Claims 26 and 27

have been added to alternatively define the invention.

Claims 1-6, 8-14 and 17-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Moskowitz (US 20030200439) in view of Tarnoff (US 20020161680).

In a related rejection, claims 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Moskowitz and Tarnoff as applied to claims 1 and 14 above, and

further in view of Jennings et al. (US 2002/0099842).

These rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Each of the claims has been amended to describe generating consumption activity

reports in response to the designated type of the content file by the content tag of the

content file.

This feature is neither shown nor suggested by the applied references.

Certainly, this feature is not suggested by the Moskowitz application. In fact,

page 3 of the pending Office Action states:

Moskowitz discloses all the limitations of claims 1, 19 and 25 except for

the watermark including a type of the content file.

So, the basic notion of type designation is not disclosed in this application much

less the generation of the claimed activity reports.

The Tarnoff application is directed to a distributed content management system

that notifies others of content changes, for example. As such, it does not provide for

content file type determination at a content aware node, as claimed. Further, the Tarnoff

application does not suggest the claimed activity report generation based on the content

tag type information that is read by the node.

7 of 7

Application No.: 10/673,161

Amendment dated: September 8, 2009

Reply to Office Action of November 7, 2008

Attorney Docket No.: 0016.0025US1

For these reasons, withdrawal of the rejection is requested, since there is no prima

facie obviousness.

It is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance. A Notice

of Allowance is respectfully solicited. Should any questions arise, the Examiner is

encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

By /grant houston/ J. Grant Houston

Registration No.: 35,900 Tel.: 781 863 9991

Fax: 781 863 9931

Lexington, Massachusetts 02421

Date: September 8, 2009